

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

IBRAHIMA WANE,	)	Case No.: 1:22-cv-0813 JLT BAM
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER ADOPTING IN FULL THE FINDINGS
	)	AND RECOMMENDATIONS, GRANTING
v.	)	DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY
	)	JUDGMENT FOR FAILURE TO EXHAUST
W. KORKOR, et al.,	)	ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES, AND
	)	DIRECTING THE CLERK OF COURT TO CLOSE
Defendants.	)	THIS CASE
	)	
	)	(Docs. 36, 41)
	)	

Ibrahima Wane seeks to hold the defendants—two physicians who offer care at California Substance Abuse and Treatment Facility—liable for violations of his civil rights under the Eighth Amendment. (*See* Doc. 15.) Defendants move for summary judgment, asserting Plaintiff failed to exhaust his administrative remedies as required under the Prison Litigation Reform Act and his claims related to treatment more than four years before filing are barred. (Doc. 36.)

The magistrate judge noted Plaintiff “raised no argument in opposition to Defendants’ contention that his claims arising from events prior to July 1, 2018 are barred by the statute of limitations.” (Doc. 41 at 10.) In addition, the magistrate judge found it was “undisputed that Plaintiff did not fully exhaust any administrative remedies with respect to his claims in this action for any medical treatment that occurred after July 1, 2018.” (*Id.*) Instead, the magistrate judge found Plaintiff’s evidence showed only that he filed a grievance at the institutional level, and the grievance

1 was not exhausted to a higher level. (*Id.*) Finally, the magistrate judge found “the continuing-  
2 violations doctrine does not apply to Plaintiff’s claims.” (*Id.* at 11-12.) Therefore, the magistrate judge  
3 recommended the Court grant Defendants’ motion for summary judgment. (*Id.* at 12.)

4 The Court served the Findings and Recommendations on the parties and notified them that any  
5 objections were due within 14 days. (Doc. 41 at 12.) The Court also advised Plaintiff that the “failure  
6 to file objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of the ‘right to challenge the  
7 magistrate’s factual findings’ on appeal.” (*Id.*, quoting *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39  
8 (9th Cir. 2014).) Plaintiff did not file objections, and the time to do so has passed.

9 According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this Court performed a *de novo* review of this case. Having  
10 carefully reviewed the matter, the Court concludes the Findings and Recommendations are supported  
11 by the record and proper analysis. Thus, the Court **ORDERS**:

- 12 1. The Findings and Recommendations dated March 11, 2025 (Doc. 41) are **ADOPTED**  
13 in full.
- 14 2. Defendants’ motion for summary judgment (Doc. 36) is **GRANTED**.
- 15 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

16  
17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: **March 29, 2025**

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE